

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/889,241	07/13/2001	Hiroki Koyama	2282-0142P	8879
2292	7590 07/20/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STE	WART KOLASCH &	GRIFFIN, WALTER DEAN		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1764		

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/889,241	KOYAMA ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Walter D. Griffin	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (1) and the compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same of th	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).</li> </ul>	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	<del></del>	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-5,7,8,11,15,16 and 19-21.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:						
·		Walter D. D. J. Walter D. Griffin Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1764				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the following reasons. The argument that the Cash reference does not disclose stripping as claimed is not persuasive. Cash injects hydrogen into a unit where it mixes with downflowing liquid. The sieve tray mounted between the vapor withdrawal device and the hydrogen injection device restricts the backflow of hydrogen to the withdrawal device. Cash, however, does not disclose that the sieve tray prevents the backflow of hydrogen. Therefore, the examiner maintains that at least some hydrogen flows countercurrently to the liquid and would necessarily strip some components from the liquid. Therefore, the examiner maintains that the claim language does not distinguish over that which is disclosed by Cash. Additionally, applicant discusses some data that alleges to show unexpected sulfur contents resulting from the use of the claimed unit. While the unit discussed in applicant's remarks appears to distinguish over that disclosed by Cash because it contains, among other features, a high pressure separation vessel and a high pressure stripping tower, such features are not contained in the claims. Therefore, applicant's data concerning unexpected sulfur contents are not commensurate in scope with the claims.